

# **Interagency Working Group for Community-Based Participatory Research**

Meeting summary  
October 30, 2003  
6100 Executive Blvd., Suite 2B-03  
Rockville, MD

---

## **Participants**

- |                                    |                               |
|------------------------------------|-------------------------------|
| 1. Larry Fine, OBSSR/NIH           | 9. Liam O'Fallon, NIEHS/NIH   |
| 2. Janice Phillips, NINR/NIH       | 10. David Kuehn, USDOT/FHWA   |
| 3. Shawna Mercer, CDC              | 11. Jan Howard, NIAAA         |
| 4. Audrey Burwell, OMH/DHHS        | 12. Ruth Nojack-Raymer, NIDCR |
| 5. Tim Kramer, USDA                | 13. Reva Lawrence, NIAMS      |
| 6. Wendy Johnson-Taylor, NIDDK/NIH | 14. Morgan Jackson, NCCAM     |
| 7. Delores Parron, OD/NIH          | 15. Carmen Moten, NIMH        |
| 8. Shobha Srinivasan, NIEHS/NIH    | 16. Eleanor Hanna, OD-ORWH    |

## **Summary**

The meeting began at 10:05 a.m. Liam O'Fallon opened the meeting by reviewing the agenda and then inviting participants to introduce themselves. We focused on two primary topics: (1) Symposium Proposal and (2) Grant Program Proposal.

### **Symposium Proposal**

We had a very animated discussion of this proposed event, beginning with the title. The subcommittee had suggested that the title not have "Community-based Participatory Research" in it to attract a larger audience. Some IWG members expressed a desire to have "CBPR" in the title. Other members suggested that the title needed to have the word "Science" in it. The discussion was tabled.

We walked through and discussed each section of the proposal. Concern was expressed that the goal emphasized too much of an advocacy posture, and that we should include language that suggested we would be examining both the positives and the potential pitfalls of CBPR. Participants agreed on the change. Participants also agreed that we need to emphasize that CBPR is only one of many research processes that can be used by investigators.

Comments regarding the identified target audiences were helpful. It was pointed out that sometimes community-based organizations do not involve community leaders. Therefore, it was proposed that community leaders be identified as a target audience. Several participants noted that the bulleted list needs to be consistent with the table.

The specific aims need to be more precise. Some new language was offered that will be incorporated into the next version. Four possible new aims include:

1. Consider evidence for, benefits of, potential pitfalls of and directions for the future.
2. Highlight the state of the science [we will need to clarify what we mean here]
3. Define CBPR concepts and strategies
4. Describe range of CBPR

Participants emphasized that “State of the science” needs clarification because it can mean different things to different people.

When discussing the cost, format and proposed date, participants considered the focus of the meeting. Participants were asked to think whether they wanted to have a broad meeting that didn’t go very deep into the various subject topics or have a focused meeting that delved deeply into the subject. On the basis of comments, there was greater interest in covering a broad range of topics. IWG members are asked to find out what their institute’s/office’s/agency’s ability will be to contribute to this symposium. The amount of money we are able to budget will affect the size and scope of the event. People suggested contacting Dr. Ruffin’s Center to find out if it would be interested in supporting this event. Others suggested seeking roadmap money or perhaps obtaining a conference grant. The date of the event will likely be late 2004 or early 2005.

Other suggestions for the meeting revolved around final products and sustainability. It was proposed that we consider video casting the event, offering CEUs/CMEs, writing proceedings from the various sessions, developing a website, and creating a repository of CBPR-related materials.

The discussion ended with a brief overview of next steps.

- ☒ IWG members will review the proposal and send comments to Liam.
- ☒ Liam and the symposium subcommittee will incorporate the comments and revise the proposal.
- ☒ The symposium subcommittee will circulate the revised proposal to the IWG.
- ☒ Anyone who is interested in becoming a member of the subcommittee should contact Liam.

### **Grant Program Proposal**

Larry Fine summarized the discussions had by the subcommittee and explained the two different proposals put before the IWG. He first described the Program Announcement with a special review (PAR), then he outlined the R25 (educational grants) mechanism that has been proposed by NCI. Larry emphasized the need to respond to the questions the subcommittee posed regarding the use of the R25 mechanism. Feedback from these questions will help the subcommittee write an announcement. General discussion about both mechanisms within the IWG was brief.

Some suggested that the PAR be tied into the NIH Roadmap activities (<http://nihroadmap.nih.gov/>), as they appear to be in the spirit of the initiative. There was brief discussion on the ability of outside agencies to participate in a PAR or an R25. Larry mentioned that there is existing language that addresses this issue, and that it may be a matter of two separate reviews. Shobha, who wrote the draft PAR, asked that IWG members review the draft and provide the subcommittee with feedback so that they can enhance the announcement. She invited members to send in specific questions of interest to individual institutes and agencies. IWG members can send their comments to either Larry Fine or Shobha Srinivasan (sriniva2@niehs.nih.gov).

There was a question about the R25 and how it is “capacity building.” Larry explained that it can be used to prepare communities to participate more fully in a community-based participatory research project. That it could also be geared toward the development of knowledge brokers.

There were suggestions that the announcements should extend beyond disease outcomes and that it should tie into the Steps to a Healthier US.??

The discussion ended with a brief overview of next steps.

- ☒ IWG members will review the proposals and send comments to Larry Fine or Shobha Srinivasan.
  - please send responses to questions regarding R25 mechanism.
  - please send specific questions for inclusion in PAR.
- ☒ Larry and the grant subcommittee will incorporate the comments and revise the proposals.
- ☒ The grant subcommittee will circulate the revised proposal to the IWG.
- ☒ Anyone who is interested in becoming a member of the subcommittee should contact Larry.

### **Community-Campus Partnerships for Health**

Shobha quickly mentioned two items regarding CCPH. (1) She noted that CCPH has a resource center, and that perhaps the IWG would not need to create one. (2) She brought to the attention of all participants that CCPH has created a National Commission to reward health care professionals for involvement in CBPR. You can read more about it on the CCPH website -- <http://futurehealth.ucsf.edu/ccph/kellogg3.html>.

Shobha asked the IWG if they would be interested in having Sarena Seifer attend the next IWG meeting to talk to the group about her work. Everyone agreed that it would be beneficial to have her present.

### **Meetings in 2004**

Before concluding the meeting, Liam proposed dates for the four meetings in 2004. The dates are Thursdays in January, April, July and October.

#### **a. January 2004**

- i. Thursday 15<sup>th</sup>
- ii. Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>

#### **c. July 2004**

- i. Thursday 15<sup>th</sup>
- ii. Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>

#### **b. April 2004**

- i. Thursday 15<sup>th</sup>
- ii. Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>

#### **d. October 2004**

- i. Thursday 14<sup>th</sup>
- ii. Thursday 21<sup>nd</sup>

The time will remain the same (10 a.m. until noon). Please send your availability to Liam.

The meeting adjourned at 12 noon.

## **Next Steps/Action Items**

- (1) **Submit additional comments on Symposium Proposal to Liam O'Fallon (ofallon@niehs.nih.gov).**  
– All
- (2) **Respond to questions posed by the Grant Program Subcommittee.** Send responses to Larry Fine (finel@od.nih.gov) – All
- (3) **Indicate to Larry Fine your level of interest in being part of the PAR and/or R25 announcement.**  
If you have considerable interest, please send to Larry specific questions your institute/agency would like to have applicants address. – All
- (4) **Send feedback on Draft PAR to Shobha Srinivasan (sriniva2@niehs.nih.gov) or Larry Fine.** – All
- (5) **Set up conference call for Symposium Subcommittee.** The subcommittee will take the comments from the October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting and fold them into the proposal. – Liam
- (6) **Set up conference call for Grant Program Subcommittee** The subcommittee will take the comments from the October 30<sup>th</sup> meeting, in addition to the responses received by IWG members, and fold them into the draft PAR and/or begin developing an R25 announcement. – Larry Fine
- (7) **Invite Sarena Seifer to attend next IWG meeting\*\*.** – Shobha Srinivasan
- (8) **Set date for the 2004 IWG meetings.** Please let Liam know which of the following dates for each month work best. If you are interested in arranging meeting space for one of these meetings, please contact Liam. – All
  - a. **January 2004**
    - i. Thursday 15<sup>th</sup>
    - ii. Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>
  - b. **April 2004**
    - i. Thursday 15<sup>th</sup>
    - ii. Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>
  - c. **July 2004**
    - i. Thursday 15<sup>th</sup>
    - ii. Thursday 22<sup>nd</sup>
  - d. **October 2004**
    - i. Thursday 14<sup>th</sup>
    - ii. Thursday 21<sup>nd</sup>

## **\*\*Post Script**

Shobha Srinivasan spoke with Sarena Seifer on Monday (11/3). Sarena is willing to meet with the IWG in January. Would IWG members be willing to have a 3 hour meeting in January so that Sarena can talk for 90 minutes and we can discuss other topics for 90 minutes?